

Remarks

This communication is considered fully responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed January 26, 2006. Claims 1-28 were examined and stand rejected. Claims 1, 2, 14, 17, 20, and 25 are currently amended. Claims 9 and 16 are canceled. No new claims are added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview

Applicant appreciates the telephone interview Examiner Avellino accorded Applicant's attorney, Mark Trenner, on March 14, 2006. During the telephone interview, Applicant's attorney discussed the Section 112 rejection and clarified the recitations of dependent claims 4, 7, and 9. Applicant's attorney also proposed amendments to the claims based on the subject matter of claims 4, 7, and 9, substantially as presented in the currently amended claims. Although the Examiner could not guarantee that such amendments would render the claims allowable, the Examiner was encouraged by the proposed amendments and requested that Applicant file a response including these amendments for his consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112

The Office Action rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Office Action states that the specification does not disclose a direct

connection to the receiving device. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed with Examiner Avellino during the telephone interview, Applicant's specification and drawings as originally filed disclose a direct connection to the receiving device, i.e., the document is delivered from the multifunction device to the destination without first having to be delivered to an intermediate service, such as the "store and forward network" for assisted delivery of fax documents disclosed by U.S. Patent No. 5,790,639 to Ranalli, et al. For example, Applicant's specification states on page 19 that the electronic document 120 may be sent from the multifunction device 100 to one or more of the network destinations. In addition, the electronic document 120 is shown being delivered via network 130 to destinations 140, 141, 142 in Figure 1 without first having to be delivered to any sort of "store and forward network."

The Examiner said that he would reconsider the Section 112 rejection if Applicant made this explanation on the record.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. 103

Applicant believes that the Section 103 rejections are moot in view of the amendments discussed with Examiner Avellino during the telephone interview and presented herein.

Claim 1 is amended to recite "alternatively notifying a user that a copy of the document is available for downloading via the remote document history repository if a bounced message is returned to the multifunction device from

the recipient." Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed, e.g., in claim 9 and on page 16, line 32 to page 17, line 8.

The Office Action relies on Hull (col. 8, lines 20-30) as notifying an intended recipient that a document is available from a network site. However, this citation discloses an archive. There is no teaching or suggestion of the recitations in amended claim 1.

Claim 1 is believed to be allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 2-8 and 10-13 depend from claim 1 and therefore are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

In addition, claim 2 is amended to recite "track document flow, including tracking usage patterns and at least whether a document was received by the recipient and the time the document was received by the recipient." Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed, e.g., on page 17, line 29 to page 18, line 6 and page 18, lines 7-22.

The Office Action relies on Hull (col. 9, lines 30-40) as tracking document flow. However, this citation discloses an archive. There is no teaching or suggestion of the recitations in amended claim 2.

Claim 14 is amended to recite "said delivery data is accessed by a receipt service from said remote document history repository and used to automatically redirect the document . . . if the document is not received by the recipient as determined by the receipt service or if the document is bounced back to the multifunction device by the recipient." Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed, e.g., in claim 16 and on page 16, line 32 to page 17, line 8.

The Office Action relies on Hull (col. 8, lines 20-30) as notifying an intended recipient that a document is available from a network site. However, this citation discloses an archive. There is no teaching or suggestion of the recitations in amended claim 14.

Claim 14 is believed to be allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 15 and 17-19 depend from claim 14 and therefore are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14.

Claim 20 is amended to recite "the delivery data accessed from said remote document history repository and . . . used to make the document available to a user via a network site if the document is bounced by the receiving device." Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed, e.g., on page 16, line 32 to page 17, line 8.

The Office Action relies on Hull (col. 8, lines 20-30) as notifying an intended recipient that a document is available from a network site. However, this citation discloses an archive. There is no teaching or suggestion of the recitations in amended claim 1.

Claim 20 is believed to be allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 21-24 depend from claim 20 and therefore are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 20.

Claim 25 is amended to recite "wherein the receipt service reads return receipts from the at least one recipient and formats information in the receipt to include at least the time that the document was received and the identity of the recipient for recording in the remote document history repository to enhance

tracking document flow by a user.” Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed, e.g., on page 12, line 20 to page 13, line 6.

The Office Action relies on Hull (col. 10, lines 35-40) as updating a remote document history repository to indicate receipt of the document. However, this citation discloses destination information (e.g., the telephone number of a fax machine and in some cases the name of the party that sent an incoming fax). There is no teaching or suggestion of the recitations in amended claim 25.

Claim 25 is believed to be allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 26-28 depend from claim 25 and therefore are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 25.

Conclusion

Applicant does not make any admissions as to the propriety of the rejections, and Applicant expressly reserves the right to present further argument if any of the rejections are maintained in view of the amendments.

The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this matter. The Examiner is encouraged to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number below if there are any matters which may be expedited by telephone.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Apr. 2, 2006

By: Mark D. Trenner

Mark D. Trenner
Reg. No. 43,961
(720) 221-3708